

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/864,836	05/24/2001	Hideyuki Ishikawa	SHC0127 4999		
7590 03/13/2006			EXAMINER		
Micheal S. Gzybowski			REICHLE, KARIN M		
Butzel Long 350 Main Street			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE		
STE 300			3761		
Ann Arbor, MI 48104			DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/864,836	ISHIKAWA, HIDEYUKI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Karin M. Reichle	3761	

		•					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Karin M. Reichle	3761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	Iress				
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) 📘 The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) 🔀 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final reject Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The appropinally set in the final Off	riate extension fee ice action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS	hut prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b					
	∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8 and 9.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	it before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> rit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		Karin M. Reichle Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3761					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Contrary to Applicant's arguments on pages 7-8, the direction of the pressure exerted on the covering member by the core member now proposed is not the same as that previously claimed, note Figure 2 and page 10, first full paragraph as originally filed and contrast to the response, e.g. the surface shown as the skin contactable surface at the rightside of Figure 2 is not such surface, 2 is the topsheet or the skin contactable surface. The proposed amendments raise new considerations because such does return the scope of claim 1 back to that as filed 7-20-04 and treated in the Office Action of 3-24-05. Note also the first full sentence on page 4 and paragraph 10 of the last Office Action and the similarity between the arguments considered in the last Offfice action and the current response.

Continuation of 13. Other: the replacement drawing filed 2-22-06 has been approved by the Examiner.